

United States	Forest	Pacific	Regional Office, R5
Department of	Service	Southwest	630 Sansome Street
Agriculture		Region	San Francisco, CA 94111-2214
			415-705-1098 Text (TTY)
			415-705-2896 Voice

---

File Code: 1950

Date: February 25, 1998

Lester A. Snow, Executive Director  
CALFED Bay-Delta Program  
1416 Ninth Street Suite 1155  
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Lester:

The Forest Service is providing the following comments on the Phase II project. The first section lists issues and concerns that should be included in the "boxes" in Chapter 3. The second section provides general comments on the document's clarity.

**Water Use Efficiency:** Population growth in upper watershed regions may diminish the net amount of water available (especially in dry and critical years) for reallocation to other lower watershed water supply uses. Area of origin residents may be reluctant to implement water conservation and recycling measures unless there are assurances that downstream users are also held to similar standards.

**Watershed Management:** Watershed management and restoration must be considered at the watershed level, not as an above and below dam disconnect, and must include elimination of continuing causes of watershed degradation. Current conditions in some upper watersheds have the potential to negatively effect downstream beneficial uses if not corrected.

**General Comments:** Units of measure for water flow and storage need to be related in some general way. The general reader probably has no way of relating million acre feet to cubic feet per second. For example, in the discussion of the isolated conveyance facility, the reader has no way of relating the 10,000 cfs capacity to the volume of water delivered. A simple statement that a rate of 10,000 cfs over a years time could deliver approximately 7 MAF per year may be very enlightening to readers struggling to relate the various flow values.

On page 71, it is not apparent what the conflicts are with Snodgrass Slough, the Tyler Island setback or the Mokelumne River floodway. The other discussions on screens and intakes more clearly state the conflict but these three topics leave the reader wondering what the conflict is. Since these conflicts were used to eliminate alternatives, a clarifying statement

describing the conflict would be helpful. Later in the document the reader learns that Snodgrass Slough provides warm water fisheries habitat and that deepening it would eliminate the necessary habitat. That explanation should be included on page 71. Similar simple statements explaining what a "major change in Delta hydraulics" entails or examples of the physical and biological consequences would help the reader understand why the alternatives were dropped.

On page 94, the discussion on land use changes should inform the reader how much land is currently in government ownership and also what type of changes in use are being contemplated. "Some" is not very clear; does the government currently own 10% or 90% of the 200,000 acres? Even though there is not much difference between action alternatives in terms of land use, the chart seems to imply that the government currently owns very little of the land. Depending on the acreage currently owned, there could be a big effect between no action and action alternatives. Land use changes is of great concern to many and clearly stating known information can divert needless controversy.

On pages 104 and 105 it is not obvious that Alternative 3 performs better than the other alternatives based on the discussion on page 104. For example, the statement that Alternative 2 (and 3) "will reduce the survival of of young chinook salmon and striped bass" can be read as a detrimental characteristic compared to Alternative 1. A few more contrasting or comparative statements would help the reader understand the conclusion drawn on page 105.

We appreciate the opportunity to review the document and hope these comments are helpful. If you have further questions, please contact either Julie Tupper, CALFED representative in our Sacramento Office at 498-5324 or Kathy Clement, Assistant Regional Forester for Ecosystem Planning at 415-705-1834.

Sincerely,

/s/Katherine Clement

Katherine Clement  
Assistant Regional Forester  
Ecosystem Planning